Draft Project Evaluation Criteria

General categories of criteria to be used to rank projects:

- Biological effectiveness
- Applicant's ability
- Local support/involvement/cost-sharing
- Compatibility with other non-ecosystem CALFED objectives for water quality, water supply reliability, and system integrity
- Potential impacts and benefits (to third parties, other environmental resources, adjacent landowners)
- Cost effectiveness

Criteria all projects must meet:

- Project must involve only willing sellers or landowners,
- Project must comply with CEQA/NEPA/CESA/FESA and other applicable regulatory requirements and funding is available to cover these costs,
- Project must have an appropriate monitoring program,
- Project should not prejudge the selection of CALFED long term alternatives.
- Project cannot be for political advocacy or litigation
- Project cannot be used to make up shortfalls in government budgets
- Project cannot be for research that isn't directly linked to restoration efforts

General Principles:

- As projects are selected, efforts will be made to ensure a reasonable balance among projects in different stages of the planning process.

- As projects are selected, efforts will be made to ensure projects are implemented using a variety of approaches ranging from standard to highly innovative approaches including pilot projects designed to reduce uncertainty.

Questions:

- Are there other general categories of criteria that need to be added?

- Are there any other criteria that all projects should meet?

- Are the general principles appropriate?

(4)

Criteria to evaluate proposals:

Below are some sample questions which could be used to evaluate projects. These questions can clarify what is meant by the criteria. Obviously, some of the criteria for biological effectiveness would not apply to all project types.

1. ***Biological effectiveness, soundness, and benefits to priority species and habitats***
Projects that are assigned a value of "0" for this criteria will be dropped from further consideration.

A. *Consistency with Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan and Implementation Strategy*

- Is the proposal consistent with the goals, objectives, implementation objectives and targets identified in the ERPP draft?
- Does the proposal address high priority species and/or habitats as identified in the Implementation Strategy?
- Does the proposal address a high priority stressor, process, or limiting factor identified in the workplan?
- Is the proposal for an action or type of action identified as high priority in the workplan?

B. *Technical feasibility*

- Is the proposal sound in its technical approach?
- Have all options been evaluated?
- Is the proposal feasible?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the problems?
- Does the proposal have both short and long term benefits?
- Does the proposal restore or recreate physical processes where possible?

C. *Criteria specific to different types of projects*

- For habitat acquisition and restoration proposals, is the proposal consistent with the principles of conservation biology such as connectivity, diversity of habitat types, patch size, etc?
- Additional questions will be developed for other types of projects.

2. ***Applicant's capabilities, experience, and record of past performance as well as experience and qualifications of key personnel.***

- Does the applicant's experience, education, or background indicate they are capable of implementing project?
- If the applicant previously received funding from Category III, CVPIA, or other state or federal funds, did they meet the objectives of their project?

3. ***Local support and cost-sharing***

- Is the applicant or some other local group sharing in the cost of the project?
- Are other restoration programs sharing in the cost of the project?
- Is there local support for the proposal? Local involvement?

4. ***Consistency with CALFED goals for water quality, levee reliability, water use efficiency and water supply reliability (third party benefits) and potential for third***

party impacts

- Does the project also provide benefits for water quality, levee stability, or water supply reliability?
- Is there a potential conflict with these other CALFED elements that can't be mitigated or avoided?
- What other potential benefits or impacts are associated with the project?

5. Potential impacts and benefits

- Does the proposal have synergistic benefits or conflicts with other adjacent land uses?
- Does the proposal have the potential to adversely impact other desirable fish and wildlife species?

6. Cost effectiveness